DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 318 HE 025 103

AUTHOR Patitu, Carol Logan; Tack, Martha W.
TITLE Job Satisfaction of African-American Faculty in Higher Education in the South. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE 31 Oct 91
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Boston, MA, October 31-November 3, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age; Black Colleges; *Black Teachers; *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Employment Experience; Faculty Promotion; Full Time Faculty; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; Research Methodology; Sex; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Salaries; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This paper presents results of a study which examined factors related to job satisfaction and the decline in the number of African-American faculty (AAF) in higher education. Twenty-eight, 4-year, state-assisted institutions in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation region--13 predominantly African-American (PAI) and 15 predominantly White institutions (PWIs)--participated in the study. One-way analysis of variance was used to determine the difference in the mean scores of job satisfaction as measured by the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) and the Job in General (JGI) scale for African-American faculty (N=355) at both White and African-American institutions. Two-way analysis of variance examined the job satisfaction scores when categorized by age, tenure status, salary, faculty rank, years of faculty experience, gender, and size of the institution. Among the findings were that: (1) salary, gender, and rank affected satisfaction with opportunities for promotion for AAF; (2) AAF at predominantly White institutions appeared to be more satisfied with opportunities for promotion than their counterparts at PAIs; (3) faculty salaries were competitive at both types of institution; and (4) few AAF were found in tenured and tenure-track positions. Recommendations for further research and action are provided. Contains 27 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339318

JOB SATISFACTION OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

Prepared by:

Dr. Carol Logan Patitu
Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs
Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
Miami University, Ohio
(513) 529-5526

and

Dr. Martha W. Tack
Department Head and Professor
Department of Leadership and Counseling
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti
(313) 487-0255

Prepared for:
The Association for the Study of Higher Education
Annual Meeting in Boston

October 31 - November 3, 1991

HE025 103

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Logan Patitu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Park Plaza Hotel & Towers in Boston, Massachusetts, October 31-November 3, 1991. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Abstract

Little information is available regarding the reasons for the decline in the number of African-American faculty or on their level of job satisfaction. Further research on job satisfaction of African-American faculty is needed to recruit and retain them. This study is based on job satisfaction of African-American faculty at predominantly African-American and predominantly white 4-year, state-assisted institutions in the South. One-way ANOVA indicated significant differences between respondents at the two types of institutions on the Opportunities for Promotion and Supervision subscales of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI). Two-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference on the Opportunities for Promotion and Coworkers subscales of the JDI based on tenure status at the two types of institutions. Significant differences were also found when data were analyzed in the aggregate. Additionally, there were significant differences in descriptive data.

Introduction and Significance of the Study

Without a doubt, the continuing absence, not presence, of African-American faculty, who represent the largest minority group in higher education's faculty ranks, has become an important national issue. As W. Harvey suggested, a critical question that will loom before academicians in the 1990s and throughout the next century is "Where are the African-American faculty members?" (personal communication, May 15, 1989). Unfortunately, during the early years of the 20th century, African-American faculty were so rare at predominantly white institutions that they could be individually named and described (Exum, 1980; Menges & Exum, 1983). In 1960 African-American faculty still represented only 3% of all college and university faculty; not surprisingly, they were concentrated at historically African-American institutions (Exum, 1983). In 1984 African-American faculty numbered only 18,827, down 4.3% from the 1977 total of 19,674 (Wilson & Melendez, 1986). Unfortunately, the number of African-American faculty members is continuing to decline. "The number of black faculty increased up until 1976; it has declined since then" (Wilson, 1987, p. 12).

One reason for the decline in African-American faculty overall is their dissatisfaction with salaries as well as promotion and tenure processes/results and the racial climate at many predominantly white institutions. Basically speaking, their dissatisfaction in various areas (salary, promotion, tenure, etc.) may be why institutions are unable to retain them.

Porter and Steers (1973) further concluded that all of the following factors influence turnover: organizational environment (pay and promotion policies); immediate work environment (size of the organization or unit, supervisor style, coworker relationships); the job itself (requirements and nature); and individual characteristics (age, tenure). Moreover, in Pfeffer and Lawler's (1980) study of 4,058 college and university faculty, they found that satisfaction with the organization and the faculty members' expressed intentions to remain in the work setting were positively related to salary, length of time in the organization, and tenure. They also reported that salary and tenure were the most influential issues in faculty decisions to stay employed in an instructional position.

In addition to low salaries and the difficulty of obtaining tenure and promotion, African-American faculty may be hard to retain if they feel isolated and are unable to achieve success in a hostile environment. As one African-American faculty member at a university in Maine stated, ". . . all the people were white . . . . My kids were harassed in school every day. During the entire year, no one invited me to dinner, or even for a drink. . . . " (Wilson, 1987, p. 14). This African-American faculty person left the institution at the end of the year.

Additionally, discrimination may be a strong factor leading to the inability to retain African-American faculty. In a study by Rafky (1972), 398 African-American professors explained why their African-American acquaintances who are qualified for the academic profession are attracted to other occupations. The largest percentage (33%) listed discrimination as the reason they chose

professions other than academic ones. Thus, some of the factors that have influenced African-American faculty to affiliate with and then leave their universities are related to issues of race (e.g., perceived racial discrimination, difficulty in obtaining promotion and tenure, etc.) (Curry-Williams, 1985).

Institutional personnel must begin to work aggressively to recruit and retain African-American faculty by ameliorating the aforementioned problems. Once having selected African-American faculty, it is the institution's responsibility to retain them and especially to prevent them from choosing to work in governmental, industrial, foundational, and service agencies where salary advancement and opportunities for promotions are greater (Rafky, 1972).

According to a 1988 report of the Minority Graduate Education Project by Brown, "the proportion of black doctorate holders choosing academic careers has declined over the past 10 years: in 1975, more than two-thirds of the black Ph.D. recipients planned to pursue academic employment, compared with slightly under one-half in 1986" (Green, 1989, p. 82). Clearly, something must be done to halt this decline because, as previously stated, as the number of African-American faculty has declined, so has the number of African-American students. Without African-American faculty, it is harder to recruit, enroll, retain, and graduate African-American students. According to Blackwell (1983):

> In *Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals*, empirical evidence was provided that showed that the most consistently powerful predictor of enrollment and graduation of black students in professional schools was the presence of black faculty members. Simply put, those institutions that had a significant black faculty presence did a considerably better job of recruiting, enrolling, retaining, and graduating black students than those without that black faculty presence. (p. 66)

Unquestionably, African-American faculty are important to African-American students. In addition, the presence of African-American faculty is important because taking a course with an African-American faculty person is the best way for white students to overcome their prejudiced misconceptions about the intellectual capabilities of African-American people (W. Harvey, personal communication, May 15, 1989). In addition, the increased presence of African-American faculty will facilitate communication among African-American and white faculty (W. Harvey, personal communication, May 15, 1989).

Because of the importance of African-American faculty to higher education, more research about this broad topic is needed. There is a research void on African-American faculty in general; and even less information is available on job satisfaction of African-American faculty. The most significant recent study referenced is the one completed by Silver, Dennis, and Spikes (1988) on African-American faculty at traditionally white institutions. The limitations of this research effort were not surprising for as Finkelstein (1987) commented, ". . . investigators have focused their attention on black faculty at predominately white colleges and universities" (p. 72).

Leaders in higher education can only gain from further research if they intend to recruit and retain African-American faculty who may be the key to graduating African-American students. They must know more about the attitudes and perceptions of African-American faculty regarding job satisfaction. They also need to be cognizant of areas of dissatisfaction that often cause African-American faculty to leave the academic profession, action that, therefore, discourages other African-Americans from entering the academy.

Research Methodology

The credibility and objectivity of data collected and of conclusions drawn are established by the research methodology used in any study. Therefore, the following topics are discussed: research hypotheses, sample selection, instrument selection, data collection, and data analyses.

Research Hypotheses

Two null hypotheses guided the collection and analysis of data, and each null hypothesis was not accepted if its significance level reached the .05 level. The hypotheses used in this study were as follows:

1. There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of job satisfaction as measured by Work on the Present Job, Present Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and Coworkers on the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale for African-American faculty at predominantly African-American 4-year, state-assisted institutions as compared to African-American faculty at predominantly white 4-year, state-assisted institutions.
2. There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of job satisfaction as measured by Work on the Present Job, Present Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, Supervision, and Coworkers on the Job Descriptive Index and the Job in General scale for African-American faculty due to type of institution and (a) age, (b) tenure status, (c) salary, (d) faculty rank, (e) years of faculty experience, (f) gender, and (g) size of the institution.

Sample Selection

For this study African-American faculty were selected from 4-year, state-assisted predominantly African-American institutions (PAIs) and predominantly white institutions (PWIs) in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) region. The SACS region, which includes the states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, was chosen because of the existence of numerous PAIs within this geographical area. Also, only those PAIs with 80% or more African-American student enrollment were involved in the study. With the aforementioned limitations, 22 PAIs were eligible to participate in the study. However, only 4-year, state-assisted institutions with an enrollment of 2,000 or more students were used in the study, thus reducing the number of PAIs from which African-American faculty were selected from 22 to 16. The number of full-time faculty persons at the 16 selected institutions ranged from 120 to 475 (Peterson's College Database, 1989).

Sixteen 4-year, state-assisted predominantly white institutions were matched to the predominantly African-American institutions in the SACS states based on geographic location, student headcount enrollment, and degree authority. It should be noted that the PWIs had to have an 80% or more white enrollment and a base of 2,000 or more students to be eligible to participate in the study. In classifying institutions based on degree authority, the following levels were used: Level 1 - Associate degree authority, Level 2 - Bachelor's degree authority, Level 3 - Master's degree authority, and Level 4 - Doctor's degree authority.

Presidents and vice presidents of academic affairs of the 32 institutions were contacted and asked to identify the name, rank, and departmental affiliation of all African-American faculty at their respective institutions. All vice presidents from the 16 predominantly white institutions responded, for a response rate of 100%. However, one of the institutions had no African-American faculty, thus, actually limiting the participating white institutions to 15, for an actual response rate of 93.75%. Thirteen or 81% of the 16 predominantly African-American institutions responded. Based on the lists received from the participating institutions, the names of African-American faculty were then compiled by rank for each type of institution, that is, PAIs and PWIs.

The number of African-American faculty at the PAIs totaled 1,987. From this number a sample of 208 subjects from the African-American institutions stratified by rank, that is, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor, was randomly selected. Thus, there were 16 subjects from each predominantly African-American institution (13 x 16 = 208) with 4 per rank per institution. Only 147 African-American faculty persons were employed at the 16 predominantly white institutions; therefore, all were included in the study.

African-American faculty at the two types of institutions were then sent a demographic questionnaire developed by Logan (1990). In addition, each participant received the Job in General (JIG) scale and the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), a measure of job satisfaction. Of the 355 instruments distributed, 245 instruments were returned, representing a combined response rate of 69%. For African-American faculty at the predominantly white institutions, 116 of 147 instruments were returned for a response rate of 79%; for African-American faculty at the predominantly African-American institutions, 129 of 208 instruments were returned for a response rate of 62%.

Instrument Selection

The principal survey instrument used in this study was the Job Descriptive Index developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). The JDI contains the following five subscales: (a) Work on the Present Job, (b) Present Pay, (c) Opportunities for Promotion, (d) Supervision, and (e) Coworkers. Pertaining to the Job in General (JIG) scale, which is typically given after the JDI (P. Cain Smith, personal communication, April 18, 1990), in 1982 Bowling Green State University received a copyright for the instrument; and the JIG was subsequently revised in 1985. The five subscales of the JDI were developed prior to 1968. In 1969 Rand McNally and Company was issued a copyright; in 1975 Bowling Green State University received a copyright, and the instrument was subsequently revised in 1985.

For the JIG and each subscale of the JDI, the respondents marked Y ("Yes") beside each word or phrase that described their work or N ("No") if it did not describe it. If they could not decide, they put a "?" in the space provided. The JDI was scored using a direct scoring method as suggested by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). When the respondent answered "yes" to a positive item or "no" to a negative item on the instrument, he or she received three points. If the respondent put a "?" on any item, he or she received one point. Zero points were scored for answering "yes" to a negative item or "no" to a positive item. Responses for the Pay and Promotion scales, which have nine items each, were doubled in order to make them numerically equivalent to the scores for the other subscales, which have 18 items each.

A total score was not computed because the authors of the inventory do not recommend such action; in effect, the instrument is not validated for the calculation of a total score (P. Cain Smith, personal communication, May 22, 1989). According to information provided on scoring the JDI, the subscales developed prior to 1969 are discriminately different, have loaded on separate group factors with no general factor in repeated factor analytical studies, and do not intercorrelate highly despite their high reliabilities (P. Cain Smith, personal communication, May 22, 1989). Different aspects of, and changes in, the situation also affect the five subscales differently; thus, adding sub-scores is like adding apples and oranges (P. Cain Smith, personal communication, May 22, 1989).

However, with the JIG scale, it is recommended that a summary score be calculated to determine whether overall satisfaction is related to such behaviors as quitting the job, seeking career change, or other long-term actions (P. Cain Smith, personal communication, June 14, 1989). According to B. Sandman (personal communication, June 14, 1989) and P. Cain Smith (personal communication, April 18, 1990), a summary score for the JIG scale indicates an individual's overall job satisfaction.

Besides being simple, direct, and easy to score, the items on the instrument are those with universal application; and they are appropriate for different departments/colleges. Furthermore, the instrument incorporates the most important factors relating to job satisfaction; and the validity and reliability coefficients of the JDI are acceptable (Smith et al., 1969). Concerning reliability, "there are numerous correlations above .7 and .8 between JDI measures and other measures of satisfaction obtained by different methods, either concurrently or with very short term intervals" (Smith et al., 1969, p. 75).

The JDI has also been shown to have both discriminant and convergent validity (both within and across samples). As Smith et al. (1969) stated, "Our measures should allow us to distinguish

satisfaction with pay from satisfaction with work, and in turn to distinguish these from satisfaction with other aspects of the job" (p. 38). Being able to distinguish satisfaction from one scale to another allows the researcher to examine each scale separately.

On the demographic questionnaire used in the study, African-American faculty were asked to provide information relating to their number of years in a faculty position, the number of years they had taught at the institution, faculty rank, tenure status, salary, age, gender, and ethnic background. In addition, questions related to present teaching assignments, number of faculty in their academic department, and the number of faculty of their ethnic origin in their academic department were posed.

Data Collection

The identified faculty were sent the Job Description Index; the demographic questionnaire; a cover letter; and a self-addressed stamped return envelope. A six-digit code was printed on the back of the envelope in the bottom left-hand corner as a means of identifying the individuals who returned the instrument. In the cover letter it was explained that the purpose of the code number on the envelope was only to aid in tracking respondents for follow-up. According to Erdos and Morgan (1983), because code numbers appear to threaten the confidentiality of information and the anonymity of respondents, researchers should not only avoid concealing such codes but should openly draw attention to them and explain their purpose.

The cover letter included with the documents also informed participants of a lottery in which they could participate by returning the inventory and demographic questionnaire. Monetary incentives have been shown to increase response rates, and these incentives often are offered to participants through lotteries or drawings. In a study by Blythe (1986), the response rate from social workers who were offered the opportunity to enter a lottery was significantly higher than the response rate of those not offered the opportunity. Yu and Cooper (1983) determined that the larger the monetary incentive, the higher the response rate, thus prompting the use of $100 incentives for lottery prizes. At the end of the data collection process, three names were drawn for prizes of $100 each.

Additionally, a post card was included that could be returned by the participants in order to receive an abstract of the results from the study. This offer was designed to serve as an additional inducement to encourage them to return both the inventory and demographic questionnaire. It should be noted that three follow-up mailings were completed as a means of increasing the number of responses. Heberlein and Baumgartner (1978) determined that one can expect approximately a 20% net return for one follow-up contact, a 12% net return for a second follow-up, and a 10% net return for a third follow-up.

Data Analyses

This was a comparative study, wherein African-American faculty were categorized in two or more groups by selected independent variables (type of institution, age, tenure status, salary, faculty rank, years of faculty experience, gender, and size of the institution). Analyses were run to determine the extent of association of each independent variable with each of the satisfaction subscales on the JDI and the JIG scale (the dependent variables). Average scores were computed for the different groups indicating their level of job satisfaction on each subscale.

One-way analysis of variance was used to determine the difference in the mean scores of job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale and the five subscales of the JDI for African-American faculty at the two types of institutions, that is, PAIs and PWIs. Two-way analysis of variance was used to look at differences in the mean scores of job satisfaction as measured by the JIG scale and the five subscales of the JDI for African-American faculty at the two types of institutions when

they were categorized by (a) age, (b) tenure status, (c) salary, (d) faculty rank, (e) years of faculty experience, (f) gender, and (g) size of the institution.

Research Findings

The following conclusions are based on data gathered in the study and literature reviewed by the researchers.

1. African-American faculty at the predominantly white institutions (PWIs) were more satisfied with opportunities for promotion (p=.0005) and supervision (p=.0102) than their counterparts at the predominantly African-American institutions (PAIs). (See Table 1.) Still, opportunities for promotion may be affected by many variables (e.g., tenure status, educational level, publication rates, etc.).

2. Tenure status affected perceptions of opportunities for promotion and coworkers for participants in this investigation. In both cases, there were significant differences between the following groups: (a) nontenured and tenured faculty at the predominantly African-American institutions, with tenured faculty at the predominantly African-American institutions reporting a higher mean score and (b) nontenured faculty at the predominantly African-American institutions and nontenured faculty at the predominantly white institutions, with nontenured faculty at the predominantly white institutions reporting a higher mean score. (See Tables 2 and 3.)

3. Salary, gender, and rank affected satisfaction with opportunities for promotion for African-American faculty. When analyzed in the aggregate, as indicated in Table 4, significant differences by salary occurred among six groups. When dealing with promotion issues (Table 5), there were significant differences by rank between (a) professors and instructors and (b) associate professors and instructors, with instructors reporting the lower mean scores in both cases. By gender, men reported a higher mean score in terms of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion (M=29.38) than did women (M=23.76) (p=.0138, df=1).

4. The respondents reported that the salary they receive also affected their satisfaction with present pay. In the aggregate, as shown in Table 6, there was a significant difference on the Present Pay subscale among 10 salary groups. With the exception of those earning $19,999 or less as compared to those earning $20,000-$24,999, as salaries increased so did mean scores.

5. African-American faculty were concentrated at the assistant professor level (32.6% at predominantly African-American institutions and over 50% (53.4%) at predominantly white institutions), a finding that is consistent with the research results of Silver, Dennis, and Spikes (1988). (See Table 7.) In this study the percentage of African-American faculty at the assistant professor level at predominantly white institutions (53.4%) is much higher than the percentage reported in the Digest of Education Statistics (1988), that is, 30.06%.

6. The African-Americans at predominantly African-American institutions in this study were older (age 40 - 60 or over) than their counterparts at the predominantly white institutions (between ages 30-39). (See Table 8.) As a matter of fact, the oldest full-time faculty member at the predominantly African-American institutions was 73 years of age.

7. Salaries of faculty at predominantly African-American institutions were competitive with salaries of faculty at predominantly white institutions. Specifically, 49% of the respondents earned $25,000-$34,999 while only 7.8% earned less than $20,000, and 6.9% were paid $45,000 or more. (See Table 9.) Interestingly, the average salary for African-American faculty at PAIs was $33,520; and the average salary for those at PWIs was $32,335.

8. More faculty in this study (n=83 or 64.3%) were tenured at the predominantly African-American institutions than was the case at the predominantly white institutions (n=34 or 29.3%). (See Table 10.) In both tenured and tenure-track positions throughout higher education, particularly in major white research institutions, few African-Americans are to be found. Of all groups, including American Indians and Asian Americans, African-Americans are the least likely to be tenured (Maxwell, 1981).

9. Faculty at the predominantly white institutions had fewer years of faculty experience than their counterparts at the predominantly African-American institutions. At PWIs most respondents (n=53 or 45.7%) had 0-5 years of faculty experience as compared to PAIs where the greatest number (n=25 or 19.4%) of the faculty had 16-20 years of faculty experience. (See Table 11.) Furthermore, the average length of faculty experience for those at PWIs was 8.5 years whereas for those at PAIs it was 18.1 years.

10. Overall, most of the respondents (51%) were employed in colleges of arts and sciences with nearly equal numbers in business administration (13.5%); education and allied professions (15.5%); and health, human services, and nursing (15.1%). Other colleges represented were musical arts (2.4%), technology (1.2%), and agriculture (1.2%). (See Table 12.) The 15.5% in education and allied professions was unusually low considering the fact that "by 1985, half of all doctorates earned by African-Americans were still in the field of education" (Washington & Harvey, 1988, pp. 21-22).

11. When comparing faculty at the two types of institutions, it was noted that the respondents from predominantly white institutions are employed at larger institutions than are respondents at predominantly African-American institutions. Specifically, 98 or 75.9% of the faculty at PAIs work in institutions of 5,999 or fewer while 76 (65.5%) of the faculty at PWIs are employed at institutions of 6,000 or more. (See Table 13.)

Recommendations for Further Research and Action

Efforts to collect information from African-American faculty on predominantly African-American and predominantly white campuses must continue regardless of the additional time and expense that these projects demand. The need to determine and to address the issues and concerns of African-American faculty outweigh the inconveniences inherent in such research. The following recommendations for research and action are offered for consideration to those interested in knowing more about this important population in the academy.

1. Given the high response rate and the reliability as well as validity of the JDI, this study should be replicated in order to amass a more substantial database on African-American faculty and job satisfaction. Specifically, research should be completed on African-American faculty at private and 2-year institutions. Of the historically 105 African-American institutions of higher education, 62 (59%) are privately controlled; the remaining 43 are publicly (state-assisted) supported (Garibaldi, 1984). Moreover, of the 105 historically African-American institutions, 16 (15%) are 2-year colleges (Garibaldi, 1984). Knowing areas of dissatisfaction for faculty is not only crucial for those at the state-assisted 4-year predominantly African-American institutions (PAIs) but for African-American faculty at private and 2-year PAIs as well. In addition, research needs to be conducted using a national sample of African-American faculty so that conclusions can be drawn about their overall job satisfaction.

2. An instrument should be developed to measure more accurately job satisfaction in academic settings. It appears that the current instruments are designed primarily for use in business and industry. One respondent at a predominantly white institution stated the following:

> The JDI questionnaire I have recently completed was somewhat difficult to fill out because, in my opinion, it is not well-suited to measure job satisfaction in academia. The JDI seemed to leave little room for measuring the degree of satisfaction (or lack thereof). Perhaps a questionnaire tailored to the academic profession in particular that could identify specific areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction could be found or developed.

3. Research should be conducted to measure the racial climate and attitudes about sexism for respondents at their institutions. Clearly, the campus climate is of deep concern for African-

American faculty because this factor greatly affects their job satisfaction. Unquestionably, racism and sexism are two realities that African-American females face. As one female African-American respondent at a predominantly white institution clearly explained:

> Job satisfaction is determined by the degree of acceptance into the community that I experience. At this institution racism and sexism are rampant and are just beginning to be addressed in the most superficial ways. My experience at this college has been very harsh and difficult because, for most of my tenure here, there were no support systems. I was the first black tenure-track faculty person hired. I had a J.D. rather than a Ph.D., and I joined a department that had no other women in it.

4. More information needs to be amassed regarding why African-American faculty at the two types of institutions differed significantly on the Supervision and Opportunities for Promotion subscales of the JDI and also by tenure status at the two types of institutions on the Opportunities for Promotion and Coworkers subscales of the JDI. For Supervision researchers need (a) to explore differences in the leadership style of department chairpersons by different independent variables (e.g., by ethnicity, size of the department, and type of institution) and (b) to study the working relationship between African-American faculty and the chairperson.

Further research is needed to determine what caused the differences in perceptions of opportunities for promotion at the two types of institutions (predominantly African-American and predominantly white institutions). The following question needs to be addressed: What opportunities for promotion exist and to what degree are they available at the two types of institutions? Each institution's governance documents spell out criteria and expectations for promotion and, thereby, influence opportunities. Additionally, gender, number of professors by rank, and the qualifications of the aspiring faculty members regardless of ethnicity are variables to be considered in a future study.

Further research also is needed to determine the factors that affect an African-American faculty member's satisfaction with his/her coworkers. While the institutional commitment to cultural diversity may play a role in perceived satisfaction with coworkers, the spirit of collegiality, a sense of shared frames of reference, and a spirit of cooperation may also be variables that contribute to a faculty member's comfort level.

5. "Among the principal reasons for much of minority lack of success in faculty positions" is lack of scholarly productivity (Wilson, 1987, p. 14). Therefore, further research is needed on African-American faculty perceptions and attitudes about conducting research. Respondents need to be asked specific questions about the extent to which they conduct research and publish and the degree to which they value research in comparison to teaching and service.

6. Leaders of higher education should become cognizant of areas of dissatisfaction that often cause African-American faculty to leave the academic profession. Then they can develop strategies for dealing with identified problems in order to retain as well as recruit these faculty members. They also need to focus on enhancing areas in which they are satisfied. The absence of African-American faculty will clearly have a negative impact on various constituents in the academic profession.

7. African-American faculty and administrators should become more informed about the seriousness of problems causing African-American faculty to leave the profession. They can then serve as catalysts for action as opposed to mere discussion of the issues. They can also serve as role models to African-American students who may be interested in the professoriate. Clearly, the support and assistance of African-American faculty and administrators are important when recruiting and retaining African-American faculty.

Conclusion

This investigation on faculty job satisfaction at 28 institutions in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation region -- 13 predominantly African-American and 15 predominantly white institutions -- was a pioneering effort. Researchers now have available information on the job satisfaction of African-American faculty not only at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) but also at predominantly African-American institutions (PAIs), information that has been lacking in the past.

It is important to continue research on African-American faculty in order to learn more about this group whose presence is important for African-American students, white students, and white faculty (W. Harvey, personal communication, May 15, 1989). It is certainly time for leaders in higher education to provide the resources needed to eliminate identified areas of dissatisfaction and to capitalize on areas of satisfaction. On one hand, the presence of African-American faculty is crucial to the maintenance of a culturally and ethnically diverse academic environment. On the other hand, their absence in institutions of higher education will not only have a detrimental effect on higher education but on society as a whole. Therefore, action must be taken now to enhance the job satisfaction of African-American faculty in higher education.

References

Blackwell, J. (1983). Strategies for improving the status of blacks in higher education. Planning and Changing, 14, 56-73.

Blythe, B. (1986). Increasing mail survey responses with a lottery. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 22, 18-19.

Curry-Williams, M. (1985). Factors that influence "other-race" faculty decisions to accept, remain in, and consider leaving faculty positions at four southeastern public universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA.

Digest of education statistics. (1988). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Erdos, P., & Morgan, A. (1983). Professional mail surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Exum, W. (1983). Climbing the crystal stair: Values, affirmative action, and minority faculty. Social Problems, 30, 383-399.

Exum, W. (1980). "'Plus ca change . . .?': Racism in higher education." Montreal, Canada: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 2-6, 1980. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 195 215)

Finkelstein, M. (1987). Women and minority faculty. In M. Finkelstein (Ed.), ASHE reader on faculty and faculty issues in colleges and universities. (2nd ed.) (pp. 66-97). Lexington, MA: Ginn Press.

Garibaldi, A. (1984). Black colleges and universities: Challenges for the future. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Green, M. (Ed.). (1989). Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Heberlein, T., & Baumgartner, R. (1978). Factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires: A quantitative analysis of the published literature. American Sociological Review, 43, 447-462.

Logan, C. (1990). Job satisfaction of African-American faculty at predominantly African-American and predominantly white four-year, state-assisted institutions in the South. Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Menges, R., & Exum, W. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 123-144.

Peterson's college database. (1989). Princeton, NJ: Dialog Information Retrieval Service, Peterson's Guides.

Pfeffer, J., & Lawler, J. (1980). Effects of job alternatives, extrinsic rewards, and behavioral commitment on attitude toward the organization: A field test of the insufficient justification paradigm. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 38.

Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 151.

Rafky, D. (1972). The Black scholar in the academic marketplace. Teachers College Record, 74, 225-260.

Silver, J., Dennis, R., & Spikes, C. (1988). Black faculty in traditionally white institutions in selected Adams states: Characteristics, experiences, and perceptions. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation.

Smith, P., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Washington, V., & Harvey, W. (1988). Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African-American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly white institutions (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 2). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Wilson, R. (1987, February). Recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff. AAHE Bulletin, 39, 11-14.

Wilson, R., & Melendez, S. (1986). Minorities in higher education. Fifth annual status report. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Yu, J., & Cooper, H. (1983). A quantitative review of research design effects on response rates to questionnaires. Journal of Marketing Research, 20, 36-44.

Table 1

Analysis of the JDI Subscales and the JIG Scale by Type of Institution

Source	PAIs n	PAIs M	PWIs n	PWIs M	F	p*
Work on the Present Job	129	39.271	116	39.595	.05	.8188
Coworkers	128	37.531	115	40.174	.90	.1172
Present Pay	125	22.256	114	25.298	2.31	.1301
Opportunities for Promotion	127	22.803	115	30.783	12.40	.0005*
Supervision	127	37.528	115	41.948	6.71	.0102*
Job in General	126	39.802	113	41.858	1.90	.1689

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 2

Multiple Comparisons of the Mean Responses on Satisfaction with the JDI Opportunities for Promotion Subscale Among Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Tenure Status

Group Comparisons	M	p*
(1, 2)	(25.34, 18.17)	.0280*
(1, 3)	(25.34, 28.35)	.3988
(2, 4)	(18.17, 31.80)	.0001*
(3, 4)	(28.35, 31.80)	.3347

Note. 1=Tenured faculty at PAIs; 2=Nontenured faculty at PAIs; 3=Tenured faculty at PWIs; 4=Nontenured faculty at PWIs.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 3

Multiple Comparisons of the Mean Responses on Satisfaction with the JDI Coworkers Subscale Among Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Tenure Status

Group Comparisons	M	p*
(1, 2)	(39.36, 34.15)	.0310*
(1, 3)	(39.36, 37.58)	.5021
(2, 4)	(34.15, 41.25)	.0035*
(3, 4)	(37.58, 41.25)	.1669

Note. 1=Tenured faculty at PAIs; 2=Nontenured faculty at PAIs; 3=Tenured faculty at PWIs; 4=Nontenured faculty at PWIs.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 4

Multiple Comparisons of the Mean Responses on Satisfaction with the JDI Opportunities for Promotion Subscale Among Faculty Based on Salary

Group Comparisons	M	p*
(1, 2)	(29.27, 11.45)	.0008*
(1, 3)	(29.27, 25.11)	.3563
(1, 4)	(29.27, 23.73)	.2103
(1, 5)	(29.27, 31.21)	.6820
(1, 6)	(29.27, 32.68)	.5196
(1, 7)	(29.27, 38.81)	.0975
(2, 3)	(11.45, 25.11)	.0014*
(2, 4)	(11.45, 23.73)	.0033
(2, 5)	(11.45, 31.21)	.0001*
(2, 6)	(11.45, 32.68)	.0001*
(2, 7)	(11.45, 38.81)	.0001*
(3, 4)	(25.11, 23.73)	.6562
(3, 5)	(25.11, 31.21)	.0864
(3, 6)	(25.11, 32.68)	.0776
(3, 7)	(25.11, 38.81)	.0048
(4, 5)	(23.73, 31.21)	.0302
(4, 6)	(23.73, 32.68)	.0332
(4, 7)	(23.73, 38.81)	.0016*
(5, 6)	(31.21, 32.68)	.7435
(5, 7)	(31.21, 38.81)	.1311
(6, 7)	(32.68, 38.81)	.2715

Note: 1=$19,999 or less; 2= $20,000-$24,999; 3=$25,000-$29,999; 4=$30,000-$34,999; 5=$35,000-$39,999; 6=$40,000-$44,999; and 7=$45,000 or more.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant. Thus, each pair of means is significantly different if the p-value is less than .05/21=.0023, where 21 is the total number of comparisons made.

Table 5

Multiple Comparisons of the Mean Responses on Satisfaction with the JDI Opportunities for Promotion Subscale Among Faculty Based on Rank

Group Comparisons	M	p*
(1, 2)	(34.57, 28.90)	.3169
(1, 3)	(34.57, 26.08)	.1222
(1, 4)	(34.57, 18.90)	.0078*
(2, 3)	(28.90, 26.08)	.3184
(2, 4)	(28.90, 18.90)	.0045*
(3, 4)	(26.08, 18.90)	.0255

Note. 1=Professor; 2=Associate Professor; 3=Assistant Professor; and 4=Instructor.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is significant. Thus, each pair of means is significantly different if the p-value is less than .05/6=.0083, where 6 is the total number of comparisons made.

Table 6

Multiple Comparisons of the Mean Responses on Satisfaction with the JDI Present Pay Subscale Among Faculty Based on Salary

Group Comparisons	M	p*
(1, 2)	(30.53, 14.00)	.0002*
(1, 3)	(30.53, 17.99)	.0011*
(1, 4)	(30.53, 20.38)	.0068
(1, 5)	(30.53, 28.25)	.5662
(1, 6)	(30.53, 33.95)	.4317
(1, 7)	(30.53, 34.56)	.4034
(2, 3)	(14.00, 17.99)	.2629
(2, 4)	(14.00, 20.38)	.0679
(2, 5)	(14.00, 28.25)	.0002*
(2, 6)	(14.00, 33.95)	.0001*
(2, 7)	(14.00, 34.56)	.0001*
(3, 4)	(17.99, 20.38)	.3694
(3, 5)	(17.99, 28.25)	.0008*
(3, 6)	(17.99, 33.95)	.0001*
(3, 7)	(17.99, 34.56)	.0001*
(4, 5)	(20.38, 28.25)	.0073
(4, 6)	(20.38, 33.95)	.0001*
(4, 7)	(20.38, 34.56)	.0004*
(5, 6)	(28.25, 33.95)	.1223
(5, 7)	(28.25, 34.56)	.1363
(6, 7)	(33.95, 34.56)	.8946

Note: 1=$19,999 or less; 2= $20,000-$24,999; 3=$25,000-$29,999; 4=$30,000-$34,999; 5=$35,000-$39,999; 6=$40,000-$44,999; and 7=$45,000 or more.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant. Thus, each pair of means is significantly different if the p-value is less than .05/21=.0023, where 21 is the total number of comparisons made.

Table 7

A Comparison of African-American Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Faculty Rank

	Overall		PAIs		PWIs				
Rank	n	%	n	%	n	%	df	x^2	p*
Professor	37	15.1	34	26.4	3	2.6			
Associate Professor	62	25.3	35	27.1	27	23.3			
							3	31.106	0.000*
Assistant Professor	104	42.4	42	32.6	62	53.4			
Instructor	42	17.1	18	14.0	24	20.7			
Total	245	99.9	129	100.1	116	100.0			

Note. Does not total 100% due to rounding.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 8

A Comparison of African-American Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Age

	Overall		PAIs		PWIs				
Age	n	%	n	%	n	%	df	x^2	p*
29 or under	24	9.8	13	10.1	11	9.5			
30-39	81	33.1	22	17.1	59	50.9			
40-49	77	31.4	43	33.3	34	29.3	4	43.024	0.000*
50-59	55	22.4	43	33.3	12	10.3			
60 or over	8	3.3	8	6.2	0	0.0			
Total	245	100.0	129	100.0	116	100.0			

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 9

A Comparison of African-American Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Salary

Salary	Overall n	Overall %	PAIs n	PAIs %	PWIs n	PWIs %	df	x^2	p*
$19,999 or less	19	7.8	8	6.2	11	9.5			
$20,000-$24,999	22	9.0	11	8.5	11	9.5			
$25,000 $29,999	55	22.4	25	19.4	30	25.9			
$30,000 $34,999	65	26.5	39	30.2	26	22.4	6	9.749	0.136
$35,000-$39,999	41	16.7	26	20.2	15	12.9			
$40,000-$44,999	26	10.6	9	7.0	17	14.7			
$45,000 or more	17	6.9	11	8.5	6	5.2			
Total	245	99.9	129	100.0	116	100.1			

Note: Does not total 100% due to rounding.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 10

A Comparison of African-American Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Tenure Status

Tenure Status	Overall n	Overall %	PAIs n	PAIs %	PWIs n	PWIs %	df	x^2	p*
Yes	117	47.8	83	64.3	34	29.3	1	30.041	0.000*
No	128	52.2	46	35.7	82	70.7			
Total	245	100.0	129	100.0	116	100.0			

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 11

A Comparison of African-American Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Years of Faculty Experience

Years of Faculty Experience	Overall n	Overall %	PAIs n	PAIs %	PWIs n	PWIs %	df	x^2	p*
0-5	72	29.4	19	14.7	53	45.7			
6-10	41	16.7	15	11.6	26	22.4			
11-15	47	19.2	23	17.8	24	20.7			
16-20	36	14.7	25	19.4	11	9.5			
							3	59.459	0.000*
21-25	22	9.0	21	16.3	1	0.9			
26-30	15	6.1	14	10.9	1	0.9			
31-35	8	3.3	8	6.2	0	0.0			
36-40	4	1.6	4	3.1	0	0.0			
Total	245	100.0	129	100.0	116	100.1			

Note: Does not total 100% due to rounding.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.

Table 12

College Affiliation of Respondents

College Affiliation	Overall n	Overall %	PAIs n	PAIs %	PWIs n	PWIs %
Agriculture	3	1.2	3	2.3	0	0.0
Arts & Sciences (Arts, Sciences, and Mass Communication)	125	51.0	75	58.1	50	43.1
Business Administration	33	13.5	15	11.6	18	15.5
Education and Applied Professions (Education; Applied Human Ecology; and Health, Physical Education, and Recreation)	38	15.5	14	10.9	24	20.7
Health, Human Services, and Nursing	37	15.1	14	10.9	23	19.8
Musical Arts	6	2.4	6	4.7	0	0.0
Technology	3	1.2	2	1.6	1	0.9
Total	245	99.9	129	100.1	116	100.0

Note: Does not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 13

A Comparison of African-American Faculty at the Two Types of Institutions Based on Size of Institution for Respondents

Size of Institution (By Number of Students)	Overall		PAIs		PWIs		df	x^2	p*
	n	%	n	%	n	%			
2,000-2,999	27	11.0	19	14.7	8	6.9			
3,000-3,999	48	19.6	32	24.8	16	13.8			
4,000-4,999	15	6.1	11	8.5	4	3.4			
5,000-5,999	48	19.6	36	27.9	12	10.3			
6,000-6,999	24	9.8	12	9.3	12	10.3	4	43.439	0.000*
7,000-7,999	24	9.8	9	7.0	15	12.9			
8,000-8,999	17	6.9	0	0.0	17	14.7			
9,000-9,999	23	9.4	10	7.8	13	11.2			
10,000 or more	19	7.8	0	0.0	19	16.4			
Total	245	100.0	129	100.0	116	99.9			

Note: Does not total 100% due to rounding.

*Any p-value of .05 or less is considered significant.